



## Corrigendum

## Corrigendum to “(Non-) robustness of vulnerability assessments to climate change: An application to New Zealand” [J. Environ. Manag. 203 400–412]

Mario Andres Fernandez<sup>a,b,\*</sup>, Santiago Bucaram<sup>b,c</sup>, Willington Renteria<sup>d</sup><sup>a</sup> Research and Monitoring Unit, Auckland Council, 135 Albert Street, Auckland CBD, New Zealand<sup>b</sup> Escuela Superior Politecnica del Litoral, ESPOL, Facultad de Ciencias Sociales y Humanísticas, Campus Gustavo Galindo Km. 30.5 Vía Perimetral, P.O. Box 09-01-5863, Guayaquil, Ecuador<sup>c</sup> Universidad San Francisco de Quito USFQ, Colegio de Administración y Economía, Campus Cumbayá, edificio Hayek, oficina 116-P, P.O. Box 17-1200-841, Quito, Ecuador<sup>d</sup> Instituto Oceanográfico de la Armada, Base Naval Sur, Guayaquil, Ecuador

Fernandez et al. (2017) carry out an examination of vulnerability assessments to climate change by allowing differing degrees of substitution among indicators. They show that results and implication change significantly under different values for the parameter of substitution within a Constant Elasticity Substitution framework.

The purpose of this corrigendum is to amend errors in Table 1 when specifying the functional relationships between components of vulnerability and each indicator. Relationships should be set instead with respect to vulnerability itself to be consistent with the conceptual framework laid on the paper (see Table 1 below). After this correction the code did not need to be modified and all results and implications hold.

Table 1

Data-based indicators, grouped into sectors and into adaptive capacity, exposure and sensitivity.

Component	Indicators	Functional relationship
Exposure	Humidity	Vulnerability ↑ as humidity index ↑
	Precipitation	Vulnerability ↑ as precipitation index ↑
	Temperature	Vulnerability ↑ as temperature index ↑
	Wind velocity	Vulnerability ↑ as wind velocity index ↑
	Average income	Vulnerability ↓ as income ↑

Table 1 (continued)

Component	Indicators	Functional relationship
Sensitivity	Percentage of population aged 15 and over working in agriculture	Vulnerability ↑ as % of population in agriculture ↑
	Unemployment rate	Vulnerability ↑ as unemployment ↑
	Dependency rate (Ratio of population under 15 and over 65 of age to the population between 19 and 64 years of age)	Vulnerability ↑ as rate of dependency ↑
	Percentage of populated area vs Percentage of AU	Vulnerability ↓ as % populated area ↑
	Percentage of forest cover to area of AU	Vulnerability ↓ as % of forest cover ↑
	Percentage of one-headed families	Vulnerability ↑ as % of one-headed families ↑
	Population Density	Vulnerability ↑ as population density ↑
	Distance to the closest large city	Vulnerability ↓ as distance ↑
	Road density (Ratio of km of road per km <sup>2</sup> of populated area)	Vulnerability ↓ as ratio ↑
	Financial position of TA per capita, downscaled to AUs	Vulnerability ↓ as financial position ↑

(continued on next page)

DOI of original article: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvman.2017.07.054>

\* Corresponding author. Research and Monitoring Unit, Auckland Council, 135 Albert Street, Auckland CBD, New Zealand.

E-mail address: [mario.fernandez@aucklandcouncil.govt.nz](mailto:mario.fernandez@aucklandcouncil.govt.nz) (M.A. Fernandez).<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvman.2018.05.038>

Received 7 May 2018; Accepted 12 May 2018

Available online 22 May 2018

0301-4797/ © 2017 Elsevier Ltd. All rights reserved.

Table 1 (continued)

Component	Indicators	Functional relationship
Adaptive Capacity	Housing stress (ratio of rent payments to after tax household income)	Vulnerability ↑ as housing stress ↑
	Housing overcrowding (Average residents per bedroom)	Vulnerability ↑ as overcrowding ↑
	Percentage of population that own house where lives	Vulnerability ↓ as % owning house ↑
	Deprivation Index	Vulnerability ↑ as deprivation index ↑
	Percentage of area on crops production	Vulnerability ↑ as % on crops production ↑
	Percentage of area on grass production	Vulnerability ↓ as % on grass production ↑
	Percentage of populated area within 5 km of the sea	Vulnerability ↑ as % populated area ↑

The authors would like to apologise for any inconvenience caused.

#### Reference

Fernandez, M.A., Bucaram, S., Renteria, W., 2017. (Non-) robustness of vulnerability assessments to climate change: an application to New Zealand. *J. Environ. Manag.* 203, 400–412. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvman.2017.07.054>.